

3/15/70

Dear Howard,

I gave your Fil trans a hasty reading while eating breakfast. Again, this is really significant stuff and you are doing beautifully. However, I would give you a caution on his conjectures about the shooting, shooter, etc. It is but conjecture and is based on erroneous raw materials (i.e., how cramped the shooter was and how that helped). Here I think whatever Dick would tell you would be much more dependable, for Dick does have the shooting knowledge and does know the circumstances as we can know them.

In the striking of a major blood vessel I think you have significance. One is that the autopsy is supposed to show the cause of death where there is more than a single wound, each having the possibility of coming from a different shooter. This seems to open the question, would the so-called non-fatal wound in itself have been fatal? If this had been the case, the autopsy should have shown this, at least to the degree possible. That much any pathologist had to know, whether or not skilled in forensics.

At the bottom of page one you are in error in saying the fragments were in the neck. I am pretty certain lower.

Page 2, I wonder about the brevity here where he says no fragments could have come from the base. I think they didn't, but before you use this, I suggest you learn from Dick whether, had the bullet tumbled in soft tissue it could have lost fragments with the rear end hitting bone. I do not for one minute think this happened, but you here are dealing with possibilities only.

In the middle of this page, where he says a softer projectile might leave little metallic residues, Dick and I both believe such a bullet was used.

Beginning on page 3, where you talk of the possibility of two almost simultaneous head shots, there are several things the meaning of which I do not pretend to be offering about which I caution you. First, there is a slide missing earlier, I believe 284, with 283 duplicated instead. Then, in the slides at the Archives, I do not recall whether in the published ones, at about 317 there is a wrong one, one that is approximately in the 280 plus sequence. Also, he was talking about the head alone moving backward and I think it was the entire upper torso, which is not the same thing. The head does spin, but not rapidly, and it is toward the left, as he was sitting. Close examination of the slides will show this. You can see the back of the neck (and no blood on it or the shirt). I also believe that at about where there is this missing slide, close examination of the movie shows a short, sharp forward motion, not as violent as at 313.

On page 5 is what fascinates me. You have only a brief excerpt, on the removal of some of the materials. Have you any more on this? A single word could interest me much. If you do not, whenever you are again in touch (please be careful not to bother him when he is busy) ask him if he can add anything. If this is true, it closely coincides with other things and it could be very important.

ccDick

Hastily,